DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 081 CE 031 145

AUTHOR Law, Charles J., Jr.
TITLE Issues Involved in the Reauthorization of Vocational Education. Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis. Paper No. 5.
INSTITUTION Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, Research Triangle Park, N.C.
PUB DATE Jan 82
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, P.O. Box 12746, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 ($1.75; 20% discount on five or more copies).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Federal Aid; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; Federal State Relationship; *Financial Support; Government Role; *Government School Relationship; Needs Assessment; Policy Formation; Program Improvement; *Public Policy; School Role; State Action; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

During the debate concerning the reauthorization of vocational education, a number of factors must be considered pertaining to the issue of federal-state relationships regarding vocational education and national purposes for vocational education. While the federal government uses education as a vehicle for addressing a number of social concerns, education is primarily a state responsibility. However, before the states can meet their educational responsibilities, a set of national purposes for vocational education must be established. Such a set of purposes must delineate federal and state responsibilities and suggest a number of strategies so that the following areas can be addressed: increasing national productivity, dealing with unemployment, supporting national defense, providing equitable access to training and jobs, providing remediation necessary for employment, and alleviating poverty. There are a number of ways in which vocational education can be improved through the reauthorization process, including (1) establishing incentives to encourage states to enact their own vocational education legislation; (2) rewarding those states developing innovative ways to accomplish national purposes; (3) allowing for differentiated funding of states, based on differing needs; and (4) concentrating on the degree to which states meet agreed upon goals rather than on procedures used to reach goals. (MN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED215081

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS

PAPER NO. 5

# ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE REAUTHORIZATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Charles J. Law, Jr.

January, 1982

*The publishing of this paper in no way suggests that it has been adopted by the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, its member states, nor their Chief State School Officers, nor should any inference be made that any member state or any member Chief State School Officer approves specifically of the items included herein.*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles J. Law, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT
POST OFFICE BOX 12746, 200 PARK OFFICES, SUITE 111
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA 27709

919-549-8216

CE 031 145

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface . . . . . i

I. Introduction . . . . . 1

*The federal authorizing legislation for vocational education was to expire on September 30, 1982. Although the time has been extended, it is anticipated the debate will begin during 1982. This paper discusses issues of reauthorization from the perspective of the Chief State School Officer (CSSO).*

*This paper deals with the issue of federal-state relationships regarding vocational education and suggests a national policy or set of purposes for vocational education.*

II. Putting the Question Into Perspective. . . . . 2

*Appropriate objectives of federal educational policy are stated and corrollary roles of the states are given.*

A. Constitutional Authority . . . . . 3

*Education is primarily a state responsibility. The Federal interest in education is built upon social concerns. The federal government uses education as a vehicle for addressing these social concerns.*

B. The Responsibility of the States . . . . . 4

*While greatly overmatching the federal dollar for vocational education (8:1), most states have relied on federal legislation as the legal base. Though willing to assume fiscal responsibility, the states seem willing to allow federal legislation to direct those state funds.*

*If vocational education is to be successful, the states must accept their legislative responsibility. The reauthorization process should deliberate such state roles and design federal legislation which enhances that state position.*

C. The Federal Responsibility for Vocational Education. . . . . 6

*The current federal purposes for vocational education appear to be: (1) to increase national productivity, (2) to deal with unemployment, (3) to support national defense, (4) to provide equitable access to training and jobs, (5) to provide remediation necessary for employment, and (6) to alleviate poverty.*

*The federal government expects vocational education to address these purposes through state programs of vocational education. This cannot occur unless a more suitable vehicle is designed through the reauthorization process. The first step is to establish a set of national purposes for vocational education which can be implemented by state and federal governments.*

III. Establishing National Purposes for Vocational Education. . . . . 7

*The national purposes for vocational education should be to enable the states to: (1) support and strengthen the relationship between education and work, and work and education, by encouraging states to accept their constitutional responsibility for quality employment-related education and training through authorizing legislation; (2) maintain the capability to respond quickly to short-term and long-term demands for strengthening national defense; (3) address the national concern for improved productivity in the workplace; (4) use quality vocational education for attracting, creating, or retaining jobs in economically depressed areas; (5) develop an education-and-training response for conserving, generating, converting, and utilizing energy; and (6) focus on the goal of full employment, including self-employment, by addressing the need for a qualified, motivated, and responsive supply of labor.*

IV. Proposed Federal and State Roles in Addressing National Purposes . . 9

A. Proposed Federal Roles . . . . . 9

*The roles of the federal government in achieving the national purposes for vocational education should be to: (1) encourage the individual states to accept their legislative responsibility for vocational education; (2) promote the individuality of the states' approaches to implementing vocational education programs; (3) provide the forum for the establishment of the national purposes for vocational education through its legislative processes; (4) support the national purposes for vocational education with sufficient funding to make their accomplishment possible; (5) assist the states in the necessary comprehensive planning required to achieve the national purposes for vocational education; (6) provide increasingly creative and substantial forms of funding to the states to be used in the pursuit of the national purposes; (7) enter into increasingly innovative and stimulating financial agreements with the states for the expenditure of federal and matching vocational education funds; (8) assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development in vocational education; (9) coordinate all federal legislation which bears, in any way, upon the states' programs of vocational education (including CETA); (10) provide the states, on a continuing basis, with the information necessary to accomplish the national purposes; and (11) develop and help finance, in cooperation with state and local education agencies, a comprehensive system of data collection and information retrieval for use in program planning.*

B. Proposed State Roles . . . . . 10

*The roles of the states to achieve the national purposes for vocational education and the individual state's purposes should be to: (1) accept the full legislative responsibility for vocational education within the state through specific state legislation; (2) establish a comprehensive vocational education program for all persons who wish to participate; (3) establish*

*and maintain a comprehensive planning effort for vocational education in the state; (4) participate in the development of the national purposes for vocational education; (5) ensure that no person will be denied access to any vocational education program on the basis of sex, race, ethnic origin, religion, or handicapping condition; (6) ensure that all vocational education programs maintain high quality instruction designed to accommodate the varying needs and different learning styles of the enrollees and also meet the objectives of the state's program of vocational education; (7) encourage innovation and development of new vocational education programs at the local level; (8) provide for a uniform, comprehensive system of educational data and management information; (9) provide improved evaluation and planning competency at the state level; (10) provide adequate financial resources without excessive local tax burdens; and (11) complete the annual appropriation process in time for effective planning by local education agencies.*

V. Suggestions for Improving the Situation Through the Reauthorization Process for Vocational Education . . . . . 12

*Each of the proposed federal roles is restated with an assessment of the degree to which the current situation supports this role. Suggestions are then made to remedy the situation. These suggestions include: (1) State clearly in the new vocational education legislation the intent of Congress to promote and support the eventual assumption of legislative responsibility for vocational education by the states; (2) Legislatively establish a system of monetary and nonmonetary incentives to encourage the states to enact their own vocational education legislation; (3) Redirect the new legislation by authorizing and encouraging the states to pursue the national purposes for vocational education in different ways; (4) Reward the states (monetarily or nonmonetarily) which develop creative methods to attain national purposes in ways which may be indigenous to that particular state; (5) Base all financial agreements with the states on the comprehensive planning efforts of the state, not on an arbitrary set of rules and regulations designed for everyone and, thus, fitting no one; (6) In the absence of a structure designed to deal with the question of national purposes, the Congress should play that role in the reauthorization process, making sure that both state and federal purposes for vocational education are fully aired and merged into the national purposes; (7) Define, on a continuing basis, the federal purposes for vocational education and transmit them for inclusion in the national purposes for vocational education; (8) Remove most of the current restrictions on the use of federal funds; (9) Delete any reference to the term "State Plan" from future legislation; (10) Require the states to plan comprehensively for vocational education and negotiate with the federal government on the basis of that planning for the use of federal funds; (11) Direct the staff of the Department of Education to disassociate a state's plan from the legal fiscal document which it will negotiate in order to use federal funds; (12) Encourage the states to increase the amount of state resources to support vocational education by permitting the states which have historically overmatched the federal funds to*

*remove all state funds beyond the required one-to-one match from federal restrictions, provided that those state funds continue to be spent in support of legitimate national or state declared purposes for vocational education; (13) Allow for differentiated funding of states, based on the differing needs of the states; (14) Encourage the individual states to establish a basic minimum foundation program of funding for education, including vocational education; (15) Identify, clearly and concisely, the goals which are to be sought with the federal funds and the matching state funds in question; (16) Concentrate on the degree to which a state is successful in achieving an agreed-upon goal and not on the procedures which a state uses, unless the procedures are themselves an objective of the agreement; (17) Provide additional funds and coordination to current efforts by the states and certain multi-state organizations for the development of policy, planning, and curriculum efforts; and (18) Legislatively establish a date by which time the Congress will consolidate all federal legislation which, in any way, addresses the national purposes for vocational education into programs to be implemented by the sole state agency as identified by that state.*

VI. Summary . . . . . 23

*In this analysis, more inconsistencies appear than consistencies. The analysis intentionally concentrated on aspects which seemed to be particularly troublesome. An analysis of the relative consistency of the states' activities with that proposed as their proper role is just as critical, if not more so.*

*The suggestions for action (most of which are legislative in nature) need to be studied, debated, modified, and prioritized in light of the current political climate. Some of the suggestions need immediate attention. Others may be years away. Regardless, each immediate action should promote the discussion and ultimate decision on the more drastic suggestions in the future. Vocational education can realize its full potential if suggestions such as these receive serious consideration.*

Appendix . . . . . 24

Footnotes . . . . . 25

References . . . . . 26

Biographical Sketch . . . . . 29

# PREFACE

In May of 1981, the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement published a paper entitled Recommended Specifications for Grant Simplification for Federal Aid to Education.[1] This paper on Vocational Education and its companion piece, Issues in CETA Reauthorization,[2] are extensions of that original publication and are based upon the same underlying precepts:

1. The belief that there is a legitimate federal role in education which should be maintained and even strengthened.

2. The painfully obvious conclusion that fragmented and piecemeal federal education programs do need to be simplifed using a more effective approach, which has direction and purpose, but which leaves the states the flexibility to determine their solutions to their problems.

3. The legacy of a federal system in which states have the primary responsibility for education, and the corrollary--that federal aid must pass through the states to the local school districts.

4. The belief that state and local educational agencies would be accountable for using federal resources to achieve national goals, but should also be allowed wide latitude to determine the best approaches to achieving them.

5. The conviction that grant simplification must occur, regardless of the level of federal funding for education.

6. The notion that agreements between states and the federal government should be based upon a state plan dealing with state problems, in light of national concerns. The content of a state's plan is its prerogative and should be subject to federal review, but not approval.[3]

ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE REAUTHORIZATION
OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

## I. Introduction

*Vocational Education Act Expires*

The Vocational Education Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) was set to expire on September 30, 1982.* Discussion of reauthorization issues began as early as September 1979 when documents were released by the Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education "to stimulate discussion, input and reaction to a wide range of issues which may impact on the reauthorization of Federal legislation for Vocational Education in 1982."[4] Since then, there has been some discussion, most of it sponsored by the vocational education leadership.[5] This paper will discuss pertinent issues of reauthorization from the vantage point of the Chief State School Officers (CSSOs) of the southeastern states.

*Vocational Education's Potential Never Realized*

Neither the full educational nor productive capacities of vocational education has been realized because: (1) vocational education's position in the comprehensive field of education has never been certain; (2) typically, it has been approached too narrowly, overlooking its relationship with major social movements; and (3) the relationship of the federal government and the states in initiating and supporting vocational education often has been confusing, contradictory, and even counterproductive.

*Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 extended this and other educational statutes until September 30, 1984. However, it is anticipated debate will begin during 1982.

*Issue - Federal/State Relationships*

This paper deals with the latter issue of federal-state relationships. The reauthorization process should debate and reconcile some historical differences of opinion on this issue which have hampered the delivery of skill development training through the state established school systems of the nation.

*A National Policy Is Needed*

This paper suggests a national policy for vocational education which might be structured via that reauthorization process. That policy could provide the necessary guidance, leadership, and resources for redirecting vocational education, while encouraging maximum state responsibility for the specifics of vocational education programming.

The suggested national policy or set of purposes is built upon specific assertions about: (1) the constitutional authority for the involvement of the federal and state governments in education, (2) the states' responsibility for vocational education, and (3) the federal responsibility for vocational education. Subsequently, a description of the state and federal roles necessary to achieve those purposes is given. Finally, a brief analysis of the appropriateness of current vocational education legislation is given with specific examples of how the new legislation might correct some of the current problems.

## II. Putting the Question Into Perspective

*Context Set*

In its earlier paper on grant simplification, the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement

stated its convictions on the respective roles of the federal and state governments in education:

> ...the first objective of federal educational policy should be to establish a listing of national concerns. ...concerns which transcend individual state or local interests,... ...Second, the federal government should provide the necessary funds and technical assistance to deal with these national concerns. Third, the federal government should review state (and not local) performance in evaluating how well federal funds are spent. ...Fourth, the federal government should be prohibited (as it is now, by law) from exercising any direct control or influence over the operation of state or local education programs or curriculum, except to the extent it guarantees constitutionally protected rights.
>
> Each state also has a role. It should see that national and state concerns, such as equal access and due process, are met and that federal funds are distributed equitably within its borders. It is especially important for state laws affording due process to be granted precedence over federal requirements whenever their overall effects are substantially the same.
>
> Each SEA is responsible for other duties as well, among them; program review; program improvement, including staff development, information dissemination, and curriculum; planning and technical assistance to local education agencies; establishing review criteria for evaluating state and local performance; fiscal accountability; and assuring public input into programs.[6]

*Previous Statements of Council Provide Framework for Reauthorization Debate*

These statements, authored to support overall grant simplification, also provide the framework for a discussion of vocational education reauthorization.

A. Constitutional Authority

Since education is a constitutionally established state responsibility (by virtue of its exclusion), one might assert that there is no legal federal role

in vocational education. However, it is not that simple. An analysis of the history of education and, specifically, vocational education gives evidence that:

1. Education is primarily a state responsibility.
2. The federal interest in education is strong, but it is based upon other social concerns (economic, political, ideological, etc.).
3. The federal government uses education as a vehicle for addressing its other social concerns.
4. Although these other federal social concerns cannot be divorced completely from educational concerns, they exhibit certain characteristics which distinguish them from the strictly educational concerns of the states.
5. These federal concerns result in federal purposes for education (via vocational education) which are different from state purposes.

*Analysis Suggests Certain Beliefs About Federal/State Roles*

B. The Responsibility of the States

Since vocational education is a part of education, the responsibilities (local, state, and federal) which apply to education generally should also apply to vocational education. Does that logic hold in actual practice?

*Vocational Education First Legislated At State Level*

It is true that the first legislation supporting vocational education with public funds was state legislation. However, when the federal government came into the picture, such legislation slowed and often

became permissive rather than directive. At that point, the states seemed to begin to wait for the federal government to initiate most legislation and direction for vocational education.

*States Seem To Assume Fiscal Responsibility*

A paradox emerges here. While overmatching the federal dollar for vocational education by an average of more than eight to one, most states have been content to rely on federal legislation as the sole legal basis for such programs. The states have shown a willingness to assume fiscal responsibility for vocational education, but have been willing to let federal legislation be the driving force behind those state dollars. Such a reliance has proven to be a disservice. It fostered a situation in which the decisions about vocational education have been dictated (or appear to have been dictated) at the federal level. Yet, these decisions are within the educational jurisdiction reserved for the states by the Constitution, regardless of the source of the funds.

*Current State Purposes*

Even with variations, the states' current purposes (legislated or implied) for supporting vocational education seem to center around (a) preparation for employment (employability) in the home and on the job, (b) advanced vocational/technical education, and (c) prevocational education (learning about the nature of work).

If vocational education is to experience its potential, the states must accept their legislative

responsibility for the program. In light of the history of the movement, this will require the Congress to understand and support such a role for the states and to design federal legislation which contributes to the process.

C. The Federal Responsibility for Vocational Education

*Federal Concerns*

As one views the history of federal involvement in vocational education, the following concerns evidenced themselves (at times, more implicitly than explicitly) and evolved into federal purposes for vocational education: (1) a concern for international commerce, (2) a concern for national defense, (3) a concern for economic deprivation, (4) a concern for the handicapped, (5) a concern for equity, (6) a concern with the nation's economy, (7) a concern for basic literacy, and (8) a concern for the free enterprise system.

Each of these concerns is social in nature. Based upon these concerns, the current federal purposes for vocational education appear to include the following:

*Federal Purposes for Vocational Education*

1. To increase national productivity.
2. To relieve the problem of unemployment and underemployment of youth and adults (particularly minority youth).
3. To support national defense.
4. To provide equitable access to both training opportunities and jobs for women, minorities, and the handicapped.

5. To provide an opportunity for remediation for those persons who have not mastered the basic literacy skills needed for employment.

6. To alleviate poverty among the less advantaged populations.

*States Must Provide Direction*

The federal government expects vocational education to address these purposes. Can this be done through state programs of vocational education? Not unless a more suitable vehicle is designed than currently exists. In the absence of strongly enunciated state purposes, these federal purposes drive the entire program.

That vehicle can be designed through the reauthorization process. The first step is the establishment of a set of national purposes for vocational education which then can be addressed properly by federal and state governments through their constitutionally established roles.

*National Purposes - A Necessity*

## III. Establishing National Purposes for Vocational Education

National purposes for vocational education are different from federal purposes and are defined as follows:

*National Purposes Defined*

> A set of purposes for vocational education which is comprised of the cumulative state purposes for vocational education and the federal purposes, each of which adds to, modifies or is modified by the other.[7]

The following tentative statement of national purpose is suggested and should be debated strongly since it can provide the long-missing overall guidance and policy.

The national purposes for vocational education are to enable the states:

1. To support and strengthen the relationship between education and work, and work and education, by encouraging states to accept their constitutional responsibility for quality employment-related education and training through authorizing legislation.
2. To maintain the capability to respond quickly to short-term and long-term demands for strengthening national defense.
3. To address the national concern for improved productivity in the workplace.
4. To use quality vocational education for attracting, creating, or retaining jobs in economically depressed areas.
5. To develop an education-and-training response for conserving, generating, converting, and utilizing energy.
6. To focus on the goal of full employment, including self-employment, by addressing the need for a qualified, motivated, and responsive supply of labor.[8]

*National Purposes Suggested*

Historically, such national purposes (national policy) have not been in evidence, resulting in state administered (and largely state funded) programs mainly serving federal purposes for vocational education. This is the crux of the

problem and must be addressed during the reauthorization process.

## IV. Proposed Federal and State Roles in Addressing National Purposes

### A. Proposed Federal Roles

The roles of the federal government in achieving the national purposes for vocational education should be to:

*Proposed Federal Roles Listed*

1. Encourage the individual states to accept their legislative responsibility for vocational education.
2. Promote the individuality of the states' approaches to implementing vocational education programs.
3. Provide the forum for the establishment of the national purposes for vocational education through its legislative processes.
4. Support the national purposes for vocational education with sufficient funding to make their accomplishment possible.
5. Assist the states in the necessary comprehensive planning required to achieve the national purposes for vocational education.
6. Provide increasingly creative and substantial forms of funding to the states to be used in the pursuit of the national purposes.
7. Enter into increasingly innovative and stimulating financial agreements with the states for the expenditure of federal and matching vocational education funds.

8. Assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development in vocational education.

9. Coordinate all federal legislation which bears, in any way, upon the states' programs of vocational education (including CETA).

10. Provide the states, on a continuing basis, with the information necessary to accomplish the national and federal purposes for vocational education.

11. Develop and help finance, in cooperation with state and local education agencies, a comprehensive system of data collection and information retrieval for use in program planning.

B. Proposed State Roles

The roles of the states to achieve the national purposes for vocational education and the individual state's purposes (if any) should be to:

*Proposed State Roles Listed*

1. Accept the full legislative responsibility for vocational education within the state through specific state legislation.

2. Establish a comprehensive vocational education program for all persons who wish to participate.

3. Establish and maintain a comprehensive planning effort for vocational education in the state.

4. Participate in the development of the national purposes for vocational education.

5. Ensure that no person will be denied access to any vocational education program on the basis of sex, race, ethnic origin, religion, or handicapping condition.
6. Ensure that all vocational education programs maintain high quality instruction designed to accommodate the varying needs and different learning styles of the enrollees and also meet the objectives of the state's program of vocational education.
7. Encourage innovation and development of new vocational education programs at the local level.
8. Provide for a uniform, comprehensive system of educational data and management information.
9. Provide improved evaluation and planning competency at the state level.
10. Provide adequate financial resources without excessive local tax burdens.
11. Complete the annual appropriation process in time for effective planning by local education agencies.

There is also a complementary role for the local education agency to play. This role has been detailed in an earlier publication.[9]

*Proposed Roles Should Be Debated*

Each of the roles is a suggestion and should be debated in light of the proposed national purposes for vocational education. The question now becomes one of the consistency of the proposed purposes and roles with the current situation and how any inconsistency may be removed through the reauthorization process.

## V. Improving the Situation Through the Reauthorization Process for Vocational Education

*Reauthorization Tasks*

Although it is evident that the current situation in vocational education can be fully remedied only through joint local, state, and federal efforts, this paper addresses only the tasks which can be undertaken through the process of federal reauthorization of vocational education. Corollary suggestions for state legislation may be found in other documents.[10]

Each of the proposed federal roles as enumerated in Section IV-A is repeated along with an assessment of the degree to which the current situation supports this role. Finally, certain specific suggestions are made which could remedy the situation.

*Encourage The States To Assume Responsibility for Vocational Education*

A. Proposed Federal Role - To encourage the individual states to accept their legislative responsibility for vocational education.

Current Situation - Federal legislation does not address this issue directly.

Suggestions -

1. State clearly in the new vocational education legislation the intent of Congress to promote and support the eventual assumption of full legislative responsibility for vocational education by the states. (See Appendix I for suggested criteria for such state legislation.)

2. Remove language from any existing legislation which does not meet this criterion or which implies a different stance.
3. Legislatively establish a system of monetary and nonmonetary incentives to encourage the enactment of state vocational education legislation.
4. Reward the states which implement or have already implemented such action through increased funding and/or increased flexibility over current funding levels.

*Treat States Differently*

B. Proposed Federal Role - To promote the individuality of the states' approaches to implementing vocational education programs.

Current Situation - Current actions of the federal government under P.L. 94-482 treat each state the same, regardless of individual state conditions.

Suggestions -

1. Redirect the new legislation by authorizing and encouraging the states to pursue the national purposes for vocational education in different ways.
2. Reward the states (monetarily or nonmonetarily) which develop creative methods to achieve national purposes in ways indigenous to that particular state.
3. Base all financial agreements with the states on the comprehensive planning efforts of each state, not on an arbitrary set of rules and regulations designed for everyone and, thus, fitting no one.

*Design Process To Develop National Purposes*

C. Proposed Federal Role - To provide the forum for the establishment of the national purposes for vocational education through its legislative processes.

Current Situation - There has been no real attempt to establish a set of national purposes for vocational education. Current legislation addresses only the federal purposes for vocational education.

Suggestions -

1. In the absence of a structure designed to deal with the question of national purposes, the Congress should play that role in the reauthorization process, making sure that both state and federal purposes for vocational education are fully aired and merged into the national purposes.
2. Design a structure to deal with the question of national purposes by:
   a. Studying the possibility of establishing a National Center of Policy Development for Education and Work. This might be a state membership organization patterned after the Education Commission of the States, except that the federal government would also be a member. (This function might be added to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.)
   b. Describing the responsibilities of such a Center to be those associated with the research, deliberations, and debate necessary to develop,

modify, and maintain a set of national purposes for education and work.

c. Providing funding so that such a function may be performed on a permanent basis. The source of these funds should include, but not be limited to, federal vocational education funds and state membership funds. Any federal program which purports to address the issues of education and work should support this operation.

3. Define, on a continuing basis, the federal purposes for vocational education and transmit them to the Center for inclusion in the national purposes for vocational education.

*Support National Purposes With Adequate Funding*

D. Proposed Federal Role - To support the national purposes for vocational education with sufficient funding to make their accomplishment possible.

Current Situation - The current allowable expenditure of federal resources is too narrowly construed to achieve some of the proposed national purposes. In addition, the funding level is too low to accomplish such major national purposes.

Suggestions -

1. Remove most of the current restrictions on the use of federal funds.
2. Provide the necessary funds and technical assistance to deal with the national purposes in a useful way.

*Assist States In Planning*

E. Proposed Federal Role - To assist the states in the comprehensive planning required to achieve the national purposes for vocational education.

Current Situation - Current rules and regulations applying to the development of the so-called "State Plan" provide a state with few options concerning what is included in its own "Plan." Additionally, the process of review of that State Plan makes it difficult to implement the concept of comprehensive long-range planning. All in all, the process gets in the way of good planning.

Suggestions -

1. Delete any reference to the term "State Plan" from future legislation.
2. Instead, require the states to plan comprehensively for vocational education and negotiate with the federal government on the basis of that planning for the use of federal funds.
3. Direct the staff of the Department of Education to:
   a. Provide assistance to the states in developing a planning process which is reasonable and addresses the necessary points.
   b. On a periodic basis, review the comprehensive plans of a state, on-site in the state, to develop an agreement covering the expenditure of federal and matching state resources to meet the objectives of that state's planning effort to address the national purposes.

c. Require no plans to be sent out of a state. Review each state's effort in light of the national purposes and that state's particular situation.

d. Disassociate a state's plan from the fiscal document which it will negotiate in order to use federal funds.

4. Provide the states with the necessary funds to assist in the establishment and maintenance of such a planning process.

*Provide Creative Funding Alternatives*

F. Proposed Federal Role - To provide increasingly creative and substantial forms of funding to the states to assist them in the pursuit of the national purposes for vocational education.

Current Situation - Current matching requirements mitigate against a state increasing its funding for vocational education. As long as the states are required to match federal funds for increasingly narrow federal purposes, they will not increase state funding for vocational education.

Suggestions -

1. Encourage the states to increase the amount of state resources to support vocational education by:

   a. Removing the concept of excess cost from future legislation.

   b. Removing any requirement that a state must match federal funds by specific purposes of the Act,

instead permit an "overall" match.

c. Permitting the states which have historically overmatched the federal funds to remove all state funds beyond the required one-to-one match from federal restrictions, provided that those state funds continue to be spent in support of legitimate national or legislatively declared state purposes for vocational education.

d. Removing any arbitrary split of funds among purposes of the new legislation. Leave such to the discretion of the state through its duly authorized "sole state agency."

2. Allow for differentiated funding of states, based on the differing needs of the states by:

a. Giving the states the flexibility of refusing additional federal funds in exchange for maximum flexibility in the use of a like amount of federal funds currently allocated to the state.

b. Negotiating with a state to permit greater flexibility in use of federal funds to establish more creative vocational education programming.

3. Encourage the individual states to establish a basic minimum foundation program of funding for education which includes vocational education. As a state increasingly assumes this fiscal function, this would allow the federal resources to be targeted on additional national purposes within that state. Accomplish this by:

a. Permitting a state additional flexibility in the use of federal funds as the state moves progressively toward full legislative and fiscal responsibility for vocational education.

b. Entering into agreements with states for a minimum of five years in order that some continuity might be established.

4. Consolidate the several categories within the current legislation in such a way as to allow a state truly to address the proposed national purposes.

5. Continue to improve upon the advanced funding of state programs.

*Design Innovative Financial Agreements*

G. Proposed Federal Role - To enter into increasingly innovative and stimulating financial agreements with the states for the expenditure of federal vocational education funds.

Current Situation - Since there is no clear statement of the national purposes for vocational education, there are no mutually accepted criteria for evaluation. Also, the current reporting practices seem to address the process used by a state more than the results obtained.

Suggestions -

1. Identify, clearly and concisely, the goals which are to be sought with the federal funds and the matching state funds in question.

2. Identify, simply and clearly, the method of evaluation which will be used to determine the relative success of a state in attaining those goals.

3. Establish a written agreement between the state and the federal government which includes items 1 and 2 above and which also identifies the penalties to be paid by either party if the agreement is broken.

4. Concentrate on the degree to which a state is successful in achieving an agreed-upon goal and not on the procedures which a state uses, unless the procedures are themselves an objective of the agreement.

5. Specify the exact data which a state must provide for evaluation purposes and maintain this requirement during the life of the agreement.

*Support R & D*

H. Proposed Federal Role - To assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development in vocational education.

Current Situation - Present efforts are not supported adequately nor coordinated properly for national effectiveness.

Suggestions -

1. Provide additional funds and coordination to current efforts by the states and certain multi-state organizations for the development of policy, planning, and curriculum.

2. Provide adequate financial resources to the proposed National Center of Policy Development for Education and Work to enable it to pursue issues which go beyond the current programs of vocational education. The source of these funds could include Vocational Education, CETA, Higher Education, Basic Skills, and any other federal program which touches the larger issues of education and/or work.

*Coordinate All Federal Employment Education Legislation*

I. Proposed Federal Role - To coordinate all federal legislation which impacts, in any way, on the states' programs of vocational education.

Current Situation - Many different federal laws establish programs designed to accomplish part of the federal purposes for vocational education. Some of these are outside any established educational institution, causing needless duplication and increased costs.

Suggestion - Legislatively establish a date by which the Congress will consolidate all federal legislation which, in any way, addresses the national purposes for vocational education into programs to be implemented by the sole state agency as identified by that state.

*Provide Pertinent Information*

J. Proposed Federal Role - To provide the states, on a continuing basis, with all the pertinent information necessary to accomplish the national and federal purposes for vocational education.

Current Situation - The only clue the states have to the current federal purposes is found in the present law. There is no clue to national purposes. Of more serious consequence, interpretations of federal purposes given states often differ.

Suggestion - Require the U.S. Department of Education to share with the states, on a continuing basis, all information concerning the national and federal purposes for vocational education, including the degree to which they are being accomplished, specific suggestions for strategies, and the possible purposes which may develop in the future.

*Approach Data Needs Realistically*

K. Proposed Federal Role - To develop and help finance, in cooperation with state and local education agencies, a comprehensive system of data collection, data analysis, and information retrieval for use in program planning.

Current Situation - Some of the information required for federal reporting seems to be unnecessary. Some data is not available at the state level because prior notice was not given of the federal need for such data. In addition, the costs of securing such data are becoming increasingly prohibitive.

Suggestions -

1. Reduce the amount of data required for federal reporting to the barest minimum.
2. Identify that minimum amount of data in the agreement with the state, at the outset, and

maintain that data requirement during the life of the agreement.

3. Provide specific federal funds to pay for any data which is needed only for federal reporting.

## VI. Summary

This concludes the analysis of the current situation at the federal level and its consistency with that proposed as appropriate. Other facets of the program could be reviewed. It is hoped that those additional facets will be pursued and new and different ideas, questions, and suggestions for legislation will be generated.

In this analysis, more inconsistencies appear than consistencies. The analysis intentionally concentrated on aspects which seemed to be particularly troublesome. An analysis of the relative consistency of the states' activities with that proposed as their proper role[11] is just as critical, if not more so.

*Suggestions Need Debate*

The suggestions for action (most of which are legislative in nature) need to be studied, debated, modified, and prioritized in light of the current political climate. Some of the suggestions need immediate attention. Others may be years away. Regardless, each immediate action should promote the discussion and ultimate decision on the more drastic suggestions in the future. Vocational education can realize its full potential if suggestions such as these receive serious consideration.

APPENDIX I

Proposed State Role - To accept the full legislative responsibility for vocational education.

Current Situation - Many states have increased the amount of state funds for vocational education; yet, most have not created the legislative foundation needed to establish vocational education as a legitimate state responsibility.

Suggestions - Each state should:

A. Enact such legislation as is necessary to establish the state purposes for vocational education, the process of governance which is to be followed, the proposed evaluation procedures, and the process of accepting federal funds into the program.

B. Establish a method of fiscal support which will provide for the eventual full state support of a basic vocational education program (as defined by state statute) and which will permit the eventual use of federal funds for new and emerging concerns within the state, as directed by the national purposes for vocational education.

C. Legislatively mandate the relationships which are to be established among all state agencies which deal, in any way, with programs designed to achieve state and/or national purposes for vocational education.

FOOTNOTES

[1]"Recommended Specifications for Grant Simplification for Federal Aid to Education," Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis, No. 2, May, 1981, Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

[2]"Issues in CETA Reauthorization," Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis, No. 4, January, 1982, Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

[3]"Recommended Specifications for Grant Simplification," p. i, Southeastern Regional Council.

[4]Letter from Daniel B. Dunham, Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education, September, 1979.

[5]A National Agenda for Vocational Education, June, 1981, American Vocational Association, Arlington, Virginia.

[6]"Recommended Specifications for Grant Simplification," pp. 3-5, Southeastern Regional Council.

[7]Law, Charles J., Vocational Education Decision-Making: A National Imperative, A monograph prepared for the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, July, 1979, p. 18, Raleigh, North Carolina.

[8]A National Agenda, p. 1, American Vocational Association.

[9]Law, Vocational Education Decision-Making, pp. 26-27.

[10]Law, Vocational Education Decision-Making, pp. 26-27.

[11]Law, Vocational Education Decision-Making, pp. 41-49.

LIST OF REFERENCES

American Vocational Association. A National Agenda for Vocational Education. Arlington, Virginia, 1981.

Bailey, Larry J. Career and Vocational Education in the 1980's: Toward a Process Approach. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University, 1976.

Bailey, Stephen K. and Mosher, Edith K. E.S.E.A.: The Office of Education Administers a Law. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968. As cited in The Federal Interest in Financing Schooling, p. 3. Edited by Michael Timpane. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1978.

Barlow, Melvin L. History of Industrial Education in the United States. Peoria: Charles A. Bennett Co., 1967.

Broudy, Harry S. Epilogue to Alternative Concepts of Vocational Education, by Lowell P. Lerwick. Minneapolis: Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education, 1979.

Byrd, Harry F. As reported in Federal Role in Education. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967.

Castell, Alburey. "Philosophy for School Administrators." A discussion paper presented to the graduate seminar in Educational Administration, School of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1964.

Counts, G. S. "Criteria for Judging a Philosophy of Education." School and Society 30 (July, 1929): 103-107.

Cremin, Lawrence A. Foreword in American Education and Vocationalism: A Documentary History 1870-1970, by Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grubb. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1974.

David, Henry. "On Thinking About Vocational Education Policy." In The Future of Vocational Education, pp. 9-22. Edited by Albert Pautler, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1977.

Democracy and Education. New York: McMillan Co., 1916.

Dewey, John. Letter in The New Republic. 3 (May 15, 1915). p. 42. As cited in Wirth, Arthur G. Education in the Technological Society, p. 215. Scranton: International Textbook Co., 1972.

Dykehouse, Jay. "Dualism in American Public Education Since 1906 With Special References to the Vocational Education Movement." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1950.

Education Commission of the States. "Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education," as reprinted in Federalism at the Crossroads: Improving Educational Policymaking, pp. 57-58. Washington: Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, 1976.

Ellis, Mary L. A Report to the Nation on Vocational Education. Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University, 1975.

Evans, Rupert N. Foundations of Vocational Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Company, 1971.

Feldman, Marvin J. "The Greening of Vocational Education." An address to the joint meeting of the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, May 6, 1976, Washington, D.C.

Frankena, William K. "A Model for Analyzing a Philosophy of Education," The High School Journal 50 (October, 1966): 8-13.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Gottlieb, David. "Vocational Educational Futures: Some Sociological Dimensions and Considerations." In The Future of Vocational Education, pp. 39-51. Edited by Albert J. Pautler, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1977.

Greenwood, Katy Lee Brown. "A Philosophic Rationale for Vocational Education: Contribution of Charles A. Prosser and His Contemporaries from 1900 to 1917," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978.

Grodzins, Morton. "Centralization and Decentralization in the American Federal System." In A Nation of States, pp. 1-23. Edited by Robert A. Goldwin. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

Hook, Sidney. "What is Philosophy of Education?" Saturday Review 50 (November 11, 1967) As cited by Wingo, G. Max in Philosophies of Education: An Introduction, pp. 22-23. Lexington, Massachussetts: D. C. Heath & Company, 1974.

Hruska, Jack. "Vocational Education - all the way or not at all." In Controversies in Education, pp. 48-56. Edited by Dwight W. Allen and Jeffery C. Hecht. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1974.

Kallen, Horace Meyer. "Philosophy Today and Tomorrow." In American Philosophy Today and Tomorrow, pp. 251-274. Edited by Horace M. Kallen and Sidney Hook. New York: Lee Furman, Inc., 1935.

Latta, E. Michael. "Options for Strengthening the Field of Vocational Education." An unpublished paper prepared for the American Vocational Association through the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, December, 1978.

Law, Charles J., Jr. "A Search for a Philosophy of Vocational Education." A paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, Washington, D. C., May, 1975.

Lerwick, Lowell P. Alternative Concepts of Vocational Education. Minneapolis: Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education, University of Minnesota, 1979.

Magee, John B. Philosophical Analysis in Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Morris, Van Cleve. Philosophy and the American School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. A Call for a National Policy on Vocational Education. Washington: NACVE, December, 1975.

Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Education for a Changing World of Work. U. S. Government Printing Office, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1963.

Patton, Nan. "Seven Cardinal Principles Revisited." In New Dimensions for Educating Youth, pp. 16-18. Edited by John Chaffee, Jr. Denver: U. S. Office of Education, 1976.

Pierce, Truman M. Federal, State, and Local Government in Education. Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Pittenger, John C. "Achieving a Rational Balance: Some Realities of Federal-State Relations." In Federalism at the Crossroads: Improving Educational Policymaking, pp. 7-13. Washington: Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, 1976.

Prosser, Charles A. and Quigley, Thomas H. Vocational Education in a Democracy. Revised Edition. Chicago: American Technical Society, 1950.

Quie, Al. "Keynote Address to the Bicentennial Conference on Vocational Education." In The Future of Vocational Education, pp. 1-7. Edited by Albert Pautler, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1977.

Swanson, Gordon. Notes in response to a first draft of this paper shared with the author, March, 1979.

Timpane, Michael and Vogel, Mary. "Introduction and Summary." In The Federal Interest in Financing Schooling. Edited by Michael Timpane. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

"What is Vocational Education?" Unpublished paper, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, March, 1979.

Whitehead, Alfred North. The Aims of Education. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Wingo, G. Max. Philosophies of Education: An Introduction. Lexington, Massachussetts: D. C. Heath & Co., 1974.

Wirth, Arthur G. Education in the Technological Society. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1972.

Woods, Robert A. and Kennedy, Albert J. The Settlement Horizon. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922. As cited by Arthur G. Wirth, Education in the Technological Society, p. 71. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1972.

Biographical Sketch

CHARLES J. LAW, JR.

Charles J. Law, Jr. became Executive Director of the Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement in January of 1980. He has served as a consultant to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, the National Institute of Education on its mandated study of Vocational Education, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the American Vocational Association, and the National Science Foundation.

From October of 1969 to January, 1979, Law served as State Director of Vocational Education in North Carolina. In January, 1979, he took a leave of absence and worked for the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education to design a philosophical base for the reauthorization of Vocational Education. Returning to North Carolina in July, 1979, he assumed the position of Deputy Assistant State Superintendent for Education and Work.

Law was born in Caswell County, North Carolina on April 12, 1936. He received his B.S. from North Carolina State University in 1957, his M.Ed. from that same institution in 1964, and his Ed.D. in Educational Administration from Duke University in 1967.

**The Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement is a nonprofit, interstate organization created and governed by the Chief State School Officers of ten Southeastern states.**

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Honorable Wayne Teague
Superintendent of Education
Alabama

Honorable Don R. Roberts
Director of Education
Arkansas

Honorable Ralph D. Turlington
Commissioner of Education
Florida

Honorable Charles McDaniel
Superintendent of Schools
Georgia

Honorable Raymond Barber
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Kentucky

Honorable J. Kelly Nix
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Louisiana

Honorable Charles E. Holladay
Superintendent of Education
Mississippi

Honorable A. Craig Phillips
Superintendent of Public Instruction
North Carolina

Honorable Charles G. Williams
Superintendent of Education
South Carolina

Honorable Robert L. McElrath
Commissioner of Education
Tennessee

## STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Erskine Murray, Alabama
D.L. Pilkinton, Arkansas
Marshall L. Frinks, Florida
Titus Singletary, Georgia
Clyde Caudill, Kentucky
Hugh I. Peck, Louisiana
John Ethridge, Mississippi
Reeves McGlohon, North Carolina
Robert R. Hill, South Carolina
Howard McNeese, Tennessee